



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,575	02/08/2006	Ashleigh Glen Quick	p29195	2529
7055	7590	06/10/2009	EXAMINER	
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191				SMITH, SHEILA B
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2617		
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/10/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com
pto@gbpatent.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/567,575	Applicant(s) QUICK ET AL.
	Examiner SHEILA B. SMITH	Art Unit 2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 27-30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 21,23- 26 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 and 22 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/1648)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 5-7, 10-13, 15, 17, 20 and 23 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 21, 23-27, 29-31,33 of copending Application No. 10/567,572. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other as shown from the comparison table below

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Instant Application 10/567575	Copending Application 10/567572
Claim 5	Claim 21
<i>5. A radio communication system including a</i>	<i>21. A radio communication system including a</i>

<p><i>transceiver/transmitter and at least two transceiver/receivers,</i></p> <p><i>wherein the transceiver/transmitter transmits data in a first time slot to the transceiver/receivers and wherein upon receipt of the data, each of the transceiver/receivers return either a first acknowledgement state in a second time slot, after the first time slot, or a second acknowledgement state in a third time slot after the second time slot.</i></p>	<p><i>transceiver/transmitter, and at least two transceiver/receivers,</i></p> <p><i>wherein the transceiver/transmitter transmits data in a first time slot to the transceiver/receivers, and wherein upon receipt of the data, each of the transceiver/receivers is configured to return either a first acknowledgement state in a second time slot, after the first time slot, is configured to return a second acknowledgement state in a third time slot, after the second time slot, and is configured to return a collision acknowledgement in a fourth time slot.</i></p>
<p>Claim 11</p> <p><i>11. A transceiver/receiver for use in a radio communication system including at least one transceiver/transmitter and at least one other transceiver/receiver,</i></p>	<p>Claim 26</p> <p><i>26. A transceiver/receiver for use in a radio communications system including at least one transceiver/transmitter and at least one other transceiver/receiver,</i></p>

<p><i>in use, the transceiver/receiver upon receiving a data packet in a first time slot from the transceiver/transmitter either transmits a first acknowledgement state in a second time slot, after the first time slot,</i></p> <p><i>or transmits a second acknowledgement state in a third time slot, after the second time slot.</i></p>	<p><i>wherein, the transceiver/receiver upon receiving a data packet in a first time slot from said transceiver/transmitter, is configured to transmit a first acknowledgement state in a second time slot, after the first time slot,</i></p> <p><i>and is configured to transmits a second acknowledgement state in a third time slot, after the second time slot,</i></p> <p><i>and is configured to transmits a collision acknowledgement state in a fourth time slot, after the third time slot.</i></p>
<p>Claim 17</p> <p><i>17. A transceiver/transmitter for use in a communication system including at least one other transceiver/receiver,</i></p> <p><i>wherein in use, the transceiver/receiver transmits a data packet in a first time slot to the at least one transceiver/receiver and receives either a first acknowledge state in a</i></p>	<p>Claim 31</p> <p><i>31. A transceiver/transmitter for use in a communications system including at least one other transceiver/receiver,</i></p> <p><i>wherein in use, the transceiver/transmitter transmits a data packet in a first time slot to the at least one transceiver/receiver and is configured to receives a first acknowledge</i></p>

<p><i>second time slot after the first time slot from one or more of the transceiver/receivers or receives a second acknowledgement state in a third time slot after the second time slot from at least one of the transceiver/receivers.</i></p>	<p><i>state in a second time slot, after the first time slot from one or more of the transceivers/receivers, is configured to receives a second acknowledgement state in a third time slot after the second time slot from one or more of the transceiver/receivers, and is configured to receive a collision acknowledgement state in a fourth time slot after the third time slot, from one or more of the transceiver/receivers.</i></p>
<p><i>The limitations of claims 5,11, and 17 of the instant application (10/567575) are fully encompassed in the claims of the conflicting application (10567572). The more specific "anticipates" the broader see <i>In re Goodman</i>, - 29 USPQ2d 2010; also see <i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i>, 58 USPQ2d 1869; <i>Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.</i>, 151 U.S. 186 (1894);</i></p>	

Regarding claim 5 of the instant application , this claim corresponds to claim 21 of intervening application 10/567572.

Regarding claim 6 of the instant application , this claim corresponds to claim 23 of intervening application 10/567572.

Regarding claim 7 of the instant application , this claim corresponds to claim 24 of intervening application 10/567572.

Regarding claim 10 of the instant application , this claim corresponds to claim 25 of intervening application 10/567572.

Regarding claim 11 of the instant application , this claim corresponds to claim 26 of intervening application 10/567572.

Regarding claim 12 of the instant application , this claim corresponds to claim 27 of intervening application 10/567572.

Regarding claim 13 of the instant application , this claim corresponds to claim 29 of intervening application 10/567572.

Regarding claim 15 of the instant application, this claim corresponds to claim 30 of intervening application 10/567572.

Regarding claim 17 of the instant application , this claim corresponds to claim 31 of intervening application 10/567572.

Regarding claim 20 of the instant application , this claim corresponds to claim 33 of intervening application 10/567572.

Regarding claim 23 of the instant application , this claim corresponds to claim 30 of intervening application 10/567572.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 8 recites the limitation "each transceiver" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

5. Claim 9 recites the limitation "each transceiver/receiver" in lines 1 and 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hottinen et al. (Patent Publication Number 2002/0105961).

Regarding claim 1. Hottinen et al. discloses a communications protocol for use in a network of devices, the protocol having a frame including a first time slot for transmitting data (as exhibited in figure 1, and which reads on transmission 1), a second time slot, after the first time slot, for transmitting a first acknowledgement state (which reads on "In particular, a first feedback information relating to the channel estimate is transmitted in two successive time slots" as disclosed in paragraph 0070), and a third time slot, after the second time slot, for

transmitting a second acknowledgement state (which reads on “The first and second feedback signals may be transmitted in different time slots” as disclosed in paragraph 0045).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hottinen et al. in view of MPEP 2144.03.

Regarding claim 2, Hottinen et al. discloses the first acknowledgement and the second acknowledgement state (which reads on “first and second feedback” disclosed in paragraph 0045). However Hottinen et al. fails to specifically disclose the first acknowledgement is positive and the second acknowledgment is negative.

The examiner contends, however, that the use of the terms positive or negative acknowledgment is extremely well known in the art, and at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Hottinen et al. with the teaching of well known art, such labels are known to be widely used in the industry.

Regarding claim 6, Hottinen et al. discloses the first acknowledgement and the second acknowledgement state (which reads on “first and second feedback” disclosed in paragraph 0045). However Hottinen et al. fails to specifically disclose the first acknowledgement is positive and the second acknowledgment is negative.

The examiner contends, however, that the use of the terms positive or negative acknowledgement is well known in the art, and at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Hottinen et al. with the teaching of well known art such labels in known to be widely used in the industry.

9. Claims 3, 7, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hottinen et al. in view of MPEP 2144.03 and further in view of You et al. (Patent Number 5,570,355).

Regarding claim 3. Hottinen et al. in view of MPEP 214403 discloses a communications protocol according to claim 2 above, in addition Hottinen et al. discloses a transmit diversity method for a wireless communication system, additionally Hottinen et al. discloses the second and third time slots are fixed in length (as exhibited in figure 3B which reads on “In FB mode 2 only a phase weight feedback values comprising two bits is fed back to the BS” and disclosed in paragraph 0016), however Hottinen fails to specifically disclose wherein the first time slot is variable in length.

In a similar field of endeavor You et al. discloses a data transmission method for a wireless communication system, additionally You et al. discloses (“wireless communication method using communication channels capable of transferring packet control data having

variable slot lengths" as disclosed in paragraph 0040) which reads on (a) a first time slot is variable in length.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to improve Hottinen et al. with the first time slot is variable in length as taught by You et al. for the purpose of enabling the receiver to accurately determine a transmission format and improving the performance of the system.

Regarding claim 7, Hottinen et al. in view of MPEP 214403 discloses a communications protocol according to claim 6 above, in addition Hottinen et al. discloses a transmit diversity method for a wireless communication system, additionally Hottinen et al. discloses the second and third time slots are fixed in length (as exhibited in figure 3B which reads on "In FB mode 2 only a phase weight feedback values comprising two bits is fed back to the BS" and disclosed in paragraph 0016), however Hottinen fails to specifically disclose wherein the first time slot is variable in length.

In a similar field of endeavor You et al. discloses a data transmission method for a wireless communication system, additionally You et al. discloses ("wireless communication method using communication channels capable of transferring packet control data having variable slot lengths" as disclosed in paragraph 0040) which reads on (a) a first time slot is variable in length.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to improve Hottinen et al. with the first time slot is variable in length as

taught by You et al. for the purpose of enabling the receiver to accurately determine a transmission format and improving the performance of the system.

Regarding claim 8, Hottinen et al. in view MPEP 214403 and further in view of You et al. discloses everything as applied above, in addition as best understood by the examiner in view of the 112 rejection Hottinen et al. discloses each transceiver (11, 21 as exhibited in figure 5 and as disclosed in paragraph 0039) monitors the transmission medium (which reads on channel) during any time slots during which each respective transceiver is not transmitting (which reads on feedback mode).

10. Claim 4, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hottinen et al. in view of MPEP 214403 and further in view of Hass et al. (U.S Patent Publication Number 2004/0025018).

Regarding claim 4. Hottinen et al. in view of MPEP 214403 discloses a communications protocol according to claim 2, additionally, Hottinen et al. discloses a transmit diversity method for a wireless communication system, however, the combination of Hottinen et al. in view of MPEP 214403 fails to disclose sufficient redundancy to allow it to be recovered in the presence of received errors and the negative acknowledge includes the transmission of a specific coded

value containing sufficient redundancy to allow it to be recovered in the presence of received errors.

In a similar field of endeavor Hass et al. discloses a secure data transmission protocol in a mobile wireless communication system, additionally Hass et al. discloses a specific coded value containing sufficient redundancy to allow it to be recovered in the presence of received errors and the negative acknowledge includes the transmission of a specific coded value containing sufficient redundancy to allow it to be recovered in the presence of received errors (which reads on “Rabin’s algorithm is in essence an error correction code, in the sense that it adds redundancy to the data to allow recovery from a number of faults” as disclosed in paragraph 0100).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to improve Hottinen et al. with the concept of a specific coded value containing sufficient redundancy to allow it to be recovered in the presence of received errors and the negative acknowledge includes the transmission of a specific coded value containing sufficient redundancy to allow it to be recovered in the presence of received errors as taught by Hass et al. for the purpose of successfully reconstructing the original message.

11. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hottinen et al. in view of MPEP 214403 and further in view of You et al. (Patent Number 5,570,355) and further in view of (Hass et al. (U.S Patent Publication Number 2004/0025018).

Regarding claim 9, Hottinen et al. in view of MPEP 214403 and further in view of You et al. discloses a communications protocol according to claim 8, in addition Hottinen et al.

discloses a transmit diversity method for a wireless communication system, additionally, Hottinen et al. discloses as best understood by the examiner in view of the 112 rejection a radio communication system wherein upon each transceiver/receiver detecting a correctly coded transmission in the negative acknowledge time slot (which reads on second feedback). However, the combination of Hottinen et al. in view of MPEP 214403 and further in view of You et al. fails to specifically disclose transceiver/ receiver discards the data previously received.

In a similar field of endeavor Haas et al. discloses a secure data transmission protocol in a mobile wireless communication system, additionally Hass et al. discloses transceiver/ receiver (node) discards the data previously received (which reads on “identifying relayed request packets, so that packets that correspond to recent previously seen requests can be discarded” as disclosed in paragraph 0059).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to improve Hottinen et al. with transceiver/ receiver discards the data previously received as taught by Haas et al. for the purpose of maintaining a limited amount of information.

12. Claims 5, 11, 12, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farley (Patent Publication Number 2002/0101839).

Regarding claim 5. Farley et al. discloses a channel to carry selected messages from each of multiple units to a base station, additionally Farley et al. discloses a communications protocol in a radio communication system including a transceiver/transmitter (18 as exhibited in figure 1) and at least two transceiver/receivers (12-1,12-2, ... as exhibited in figure 1), wherein the transceiver/transmitter transmits data in a first time slot to the transceiver/receivers (40, which reads on the forward link to forward data to subscribers as exhibited in figure 1) and wherein upon receipt of the data, the transceiver/receivers return either a first acknowledgement state in a second time slot, after the first time slot (which reads on multiple acknowledgments are sent in the different time slots as disclosed in paragraph 0008).

Regarding claim 11, Farley et al. discloses a channel to carry selected messages from each of multiple units to a base station, additionally Farley et al. discloses a transceiver/receiver (18) for use in a radio communication system (as exhibited in figure 1) including at least one transceiver/transmitter (18) and at least one other transceiver/receiver (12-1, 12-2, ...), in use, the transceiver/receiver upon receiving a data packet in a first time slot from the transceiver/transmitter (40, which reads on the forward link to forward data to subscribers, as exhibited in figure 1) a first acknowledgement state in a second time slot, after the first time slot (which reads on multiple acknowledgments are sent in the different time slots as disclosed in paragraph 0008).

Regarding claim 12, Farley et al. discloses everything as applied above, in addition Farley et al. discloses transceiver/receiver (18) further receives the first acknowledgement state in the second time slot (40 as exhibited in figure 1, and as disclosed in paragraph 0008) from the

at least one other transceiver/receiver (12-1, 12-2, ... as exhibited in figure 1) in the communication system or receives the second acknowledgement state in the third time slot (which reads on multiple acknowledgments are sent in the different time slots as disclosed in paragraph 0008) in a third time slot from the at least one other transceiver/receiver (12-1, 12-2,...).

Regarding claim 17, Farley et al. discloses a channel to carry selected messages from each of multiple units to a base station, additionally Farley et al. discloses a transceiver/transmitter (18) for use in a communication system including at least one other transceiver/receiver (12-1, 12-2, ...), wherein in use, the transceiver/receiver (18) transmits a data packet in a first time slot (40 data packet is transmitted to 12-1, 12-2, ... as exhibited in figure 1) to at least one transceiver/receiver (12-1, 12-2, ...) and receives a first acknowledgement state in a second time slot after the first time slot from (which reads on multiple acknowledgments are sent in the different time slots as disclosed in paragraph 0008 as exhibited in figure 1) from one or more of the transceiver/receiver (12-1, 12-2, ... as exhibited in figure 1).

Claims 13, 14, 18, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farley (Patent Publication Number 2002/0101839) in view of MPEP 214403.

Regarding claim 13, Farley et al. discloses everything as applied above, however Farley et al. fails to specifically disclose the first acknowledgement is positive and the second acknowledgement is negative.

The examiner contends, however, that the use of the terms positive or negative acknowledge is well known in the art, and at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Farley et al. with the teaching of well known art such labels in known to be widely used in the industry.

Regarding claim 14, Farley et al. in view of MPEP 214403 discloses everything as applied above, additionally Farley et al. discloses transceiver/receiver (14) monitors the transmission medium (channel) during any time slots during which each respective transceiver is not transmitting (which reads on “to monitor, receive and decode data” as disclosed in paragraph 0075).

Regarding claim 18, Farley et al. discloses everything as applied above, however Farley et al. fails to specifically disclose the first acknowledgement is positive and the second acknowledgement is negative.

The examiner contends, however, that the use of the terms positive or negative acknowledge is well known in the art, and at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Farley et al. with the teaching of well known art such labels in known to be widely used in the industry.

Regarding claim 19, Farley et al. in view of MPEP 214403 discloses everything as applied above, additionally Farley et al. discloses transceiver/receiver (14) monitors the transmission medium (channel) during any time slots during which each respective transceiver

is not transmitting (which reads on “to monitor, receive and decode data” as disclosed in paragraph 0075).

Claims 15, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farley (Patent Publication Number 2002/0101839) in view of New Go-Back-N ARQ Protocols for Point-to-Multipoint communications (herein referred to as XP 00470653).

Regarding claim 15, Farley et al. discloses everything as applied to claim 11, additionally Farley et al. discloses at least one other transceiver/receiver (which reads on receiving (18) acknowledge for one of the 12-1, 12-2, ... as exhibited in figure 1) however Farley et al. fails to specifically discloses receiving a negative acknowledge from at least one transceiver/receiver and the transceiver/ receiver discards the data packet received in the first time slot.

In a similar field of endeavor XP 00470653 discloses (“a NACK together with sequence number and channel BER information is sent back and this frame and subsequence frames with a frame number bigger than that of the erroneous frame are discarded” as disclosed on page 1015, column 1 and paragraph 1) which reads on receiving a negative acknowledge from at least one transceiver/receiver and the transceiver/ receiver discards the data packet received in the first time slot.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to improve Farley et al. with transceiver/ receiver discards the data

previously received as taught by XP 00470653 for the purpose of making room available for any subsequent transmission of data.

Regarding claim 16, Farley et al. discloses everything as applied to claim 15, however Farley et al. fails to specifically disclose the discarded data is replaced with data retransmitted by the transceiver/ transmitter.

In a similar field of endeavor XP 00470653 discloses (“If this copy of the frame is erroneous, the receiver discards the erroneous copy and checks the next receiver copy” as disclosed on page 1015, column 1 and paragraph 1) which reads on the discarded data is replaced with data retransmitted by the transceiver/ transmitter.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to improve Farley et al. with the discarded data is replaced with data retransmitted by the transceiver/ transmitter as taught by XP 00470653 for the purpose of making room available for any subsequent transmission of data.

Claims 20, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farley (Patent Publication Number 2002/0101839) in view of MPEP 214403 and further in view of New Go-Back-N ARQ Protocols for Point-to-Multipoint communications (herein referred to as XP 00470653).

Regarding claim 20 Farley et al. in view of MPEP 214403 discloses everything as applied to claim 15, however the combination of Farley et al. in view of MPEP 214403 fails to

specifically disclose upon receiving the negative acknowledge the transceiver/transmitter retransmits the data to the at least one transceiver/receiver.

In a similar field of endeavor XP 00470653 discloses ("a NACK together with sequence number and channel BER information is sent back and this frame and subsequence frames with a frame number bigger than that of the erroneous frame are discarded . The transmitter sends out another m(k) copies of the message" as disclosed on page 1015, column 1 and paragraph 1) which reads on upon receiving the negative acknowledge the transceiver/transmitter retransmits the data to the at least one transceiver/receiver.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to improve Farley et al. with upon receiving the negative acknowledge the transceiver/transmitter retransmits the data to the at least one transceiver/receiver as taught by XP 00470653 for the purpose of ensuring the information is received.

Regarding claim 22 Farley et al. in view of MPEP 214403 discloses everything as applied to claim 15, however the combination of Farley et al. in view of MPEP 214403 fails to specifically disclose upon receiving the negative acknowledge the transceiver/transmitter retransmits the data to the at least one transceiver/receiver.

In a similar field of endeavor XP 00470653 discloses ("a NACK together with sequence number and channel BER information is sent back and this frame and subsequence frames with a frame number bigger than that of the erroneous frame are discarded . The transmitter sends out another m(k) copies of the message" as disclosed on page 1015, column 1 and paragraph 1) which reads on upon receiving the negative acknowledge the transceiver/transmitter retransmits the data to the at least one transceiver/receiver.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to improve Farley et al. with upon receiving the negative acknowledge the transceiver/transmitter retransmits the data to the at least one transceiver/receiver as taught by XP 00470653 for the purpose of ensuring the information is received.

Claims 21, 23, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black et al. (Patent Publication Number 2004/0081124) in view of New Go-Back-N ARQ Protocols for Point-to-Multipoint communications (herein referred to as XP 00470653).

Regarding claim 21. Black et al. discloses a CDMA system that conforms to the mobile station-base station compatibility standard for dual mode wideband spread spectrum cellular system, additionally Black et al. discloses a wireless network including a transceiver/transmitter (AN) and at least two transceivers/receivers (AT), a method of disseminating data to be shared by the at least two transceiver/receivers (AT), the method including: Transmitting from the transceiver/transmitter (AN), the data to the at least two transceiver/receivers (which reads on “Multiple AT’s can be communicating within a sector covered by a single BTS disclosed in paragraph 0007); Upon unsuccessfully receiving the data at least one of the at least two transceiver/receivers, transmitting negative acknowledge data to indicate unsuccessful receipt of the data (which reads on paragraph 0013); Retransmitting the data from the transceiver/transmitter (which reads on paragraph 0013); However Black et al. fails to specifically disclose replacing the data received by the plurality of transceiver/receivers with the retransmitted data.

In a similar field of endeavor XP 00470653 discloses (“The transmitter sends out another m(K) copies of the message” as disclosed on page 1015, column 1 and paragraph 1) which reads on replacing the data received by the plurality of transceiver/receivers with the retransmitted data.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to improve Black et al. with replacing the data received by the plurality of transceiver/receivers with the retransmitted data as taught by XP 00470653 for the purpose of making room available for any subsequent transmission of data.

Regarding claim 23, Black et al. discloses everything as applied to claim 21 above, however Black et al. fails to specifically discloses upon receiving the negative acknowledge, the other transceiver/receivers discard the data received from the transceiver/transmitter before receiving the retransmitted data.

In a similar field of endeavor XP 00470653 discloses (“a NACK together with sequence number and channel BER information is sent back and this frame and subsequence frames with a frame number bigger than that of the erroneous frame are discarded . The transmitter sends out another m(k) copies of the message” as disclosed on page 1015, column 1 and paragraph 1) which reads on replacing the data received by the plurality of transceiver/receivers with the retransmitted data upon receiving the negative acknowledge, the other transceiver/receivers discard the data received from the transceiver/transmitter before receiving the retransmitted data.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to improve Black et al. with upon receiving the negative acknowledge, the

other transceiver/receivers discard the data received from the transceiver/transmitter before receiving the retransmitted data as taught by XP 00470653 for the purpose of making room available for any subsequent transmission of data.

Regarding claim 25. , Black et al. in view of XP 00470653 discloses everything as applied to claim 23 above, additionally Black et al. discloses wherein upon successful receipt of data, the transceiver/receiver transmits a positive acknowledge (which reads on “Upon successful decoding of the first half of the frame, the AN can send an acknowledge message to the AT to indicate that the AN has successfully decoded the data received” as disclosed in paragraph 0019).

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black et al. (Patent Publication Number 2004/0081124) in view of New Go-Back-N ARQ Protocols for Point-to-Multipoint communications (herein referred to as XP 00470653) and further in view of Farley (Patent Publication Number 2002/0101839) .

Regarding claim 24. , Black et al. in view of XP 00470653 discloses everything as applied to claim 21 above, however the combination of Black et al. in view of XP00470653 fails to specifically discloses the step of transmitting data is done in a first time slot, the step of transmitting the negative acknowledge is done in a second time slot and the step of retransmitting is done in a third time slot.

In a similar field of endeavor Farley et al. discloses the step of transmitting data is done in a first time slot, the step of transmitting the negative acknowledge is done in a second time slot and the step of retransmitting is done in a third time slot (which reads on multiple acknowledgments are sent in different time slots as disclosed in paragraph 0008).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to improve Black et al. in view of XP 00470653 with the step of transmitting data is done in a first time slot, the step of transmitting the negative acknowledge is done in a second time slot and the step of retransmitting is done in a third time slot as taught by Farley et al. for the purpose of supporting multiple message-types.

Allowable Subject Matter

13. Claim 10 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

14. Claim 26 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Election/Restrictions

15. Applicant's election of invention I, corresponding to claims 1-26 filed on 7/21/08 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed

errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHEILA B. SMITH whose telephone number is (571)272-7847. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:00 am - 3:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne Bost can be reached on 571-272-7023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

S. Smith
/Sheila B. Smith/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Dwayne D. Bost/
Supervisory Patent Examiner,
Art Unit 2617